DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 468 JC 960 047

AUTHOR Popejoy, Michael W.
TITLE The Underprepared Student: A Student Centered Process Coordination Model. Responsibilities, Recommendations, and Results.
PUB DATE Feb 94
NOTE 15p.; In: Proceedings of the National Conference on Successful College Teaching (18th, Orlando, Florida, February 26-28, 1994); see JC 960 033.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Preparation; *College Role; Community Colleges; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Faculty Development; *Learning Readiness; Models; Program Development; *Remedial Instruction; Student Motivation; *Student Personnel Services; Student Placement; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Student Centered Process Coordination Model

ABSTRACT

This five part paper reviews problems faced by underprepared students and describes a model developed by faculty at the South Campus of Florida's Palm Beach Community College for dealing with such students. Section I reviews issues related to defining student underpreparedness and developing a model to serve all types of underprepared students, focusing on the college's Student-Centered Process Coordination Model (SCPM) which integrates students' individual differences with the skills and resources of a broad based constituency of faculty, personalized instruction staff, and counselors. Section II discusses the predicted effects of student underpreparedness on community colleges, including budget constraints and the need to develop an integrated team approach, which includes faculty, counselors, Center for Personalized Instruction staff, peer counselors and tutors, and others, to deal with the problem. Section III describes the following critical factors related to student underpreparedness: (1) the role of faculty and the need for an appropriate development program; (2) the student's family and family history; (3) the student's self-concept, expectations, and commitment; (4) the college and campus atmosphere; (5) the availability of remediation services; and (6) the role of counselors and tutors. Finally, section IV discusses efforts by South Campus faculty and staff to deal with student underpreparedness through the development of 39 recommendations submitted to the administration, of which only 19 were recommended for further study. The 39 recommendations are appended. Contains 20 annotated citations. (TGI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 390 468

The Underprepared Student: A Student Centered Process Coordination Model. Responsibilities, Recommendations, and Results

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. Summers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Michael W. Popejoy

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper included in the Proceedings of the Eighteenth National Conference on Successful College Teaching (Orlando, FL, February 26-28, 1994)

JC 940 047

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE UNDERPREPARED STUDENT:

A Student Centered Process Coordination Model

Responsibilities, Recommendations and Results

Michael W. Popejoy, Ph.D.
Palm Beach Community College

Abstract
Part I of this paper was originally presented at the Palm Beach Community College's South Campus Center for Faculty Development in October, 1991. The original paper attempted to fit a relatively comprehensive literature search and the recommendations of campus faculty into a Student-Centered Process Coordination Model for Dealing with Underprepared Students. Part II explores the recommendations from the faculty break-out groups and discusses the long-term impacts related to faculty involvement in student development.

I. DEFINITION OF STUDENT UNDERPREPAREDNESS

A significant problem, as the research proceeded for this paper, was in locating a reasonably acceptable definition for student underpreparedness. Surprisingly, there was no universally accepted definition that encompassed the scope of the problem. For the most part, there also was no universal model of underdeveloped students. Piland and Pierce, writing in the Community College Review (1985), indicated that most states do not have a working definition of remedial education and are not convinced they need one.

The working definition used by Palm Beach Community College (PBCC) Florida is simple in terms of classification, but not very comprehensive: "those students testing below the state approved cut-off are considered underprepared" (Holden, PBCC, 1991).

However, as Mike Rose points out in his book Lives on the Boundary (1989), the students themselves, are so individualized in the manner of their underpreparedness that no model may ever be developed that would satisfy all cases. He proposes that each program be tailored as much as possible to the individual student and not to a class of students as assessed by some normed standard examination.

Judith S. Glazer writes:

> "We cannot assume that all students should be able to compete at the same level of performance, and that individual differences are a disadvantage to those who do not measure up to a national standard" (1989).

Individually designed programs may prove more successful, but they could also prove more costly since they become increasingly labor-intensive as additional teachers, counselors, and trained tutors would be required. There must be a better way to remediate the underprepared in a cost-effective manner while recognizing the essential individuality of each student.

A team approach using the Student-Centered Process Model is one option to integrate the student's individual differences with the skills and resources of a broad based constituency of faculty, Center for Personalized Instruction (CPI) staff, and counselors. With this model, it may not be necessary, or even advisable, to arrive at a precise definition of underpreparedness since it would not serve to resolve the problems of the underprepared and may actually hinder the remediation process by an overemphasis on classification.

The strength of this team approach is that it does not lay the burden of remediation program success entirely on the shoulders of a single department or group of people--it plays on the synergy of a dynamic relationship of many players in the educational environment. If this relationship, as graphically demonstrated in the model (see attachment), is working congruently; the student wins, the institution wins, and society wins as the student succeeds by persisting to graduation despite his or her initial underpreparedness to do college-level work.

II. PREDICTED IMPACTS ON COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Background

Many educators would agree that underdeveloped students will remain with us regardless of the intense efforts to reduce or eliminate the problem. The Institute for Future Studies at Macomb Community College in Warren, Michigan, reports in their annual Top Ten Issues Facing America's Community Colleges in 1991 that the numbers of academically underprepared students will continue to grow. Consequently, so will the problem of what to do with them in terms of assessment, placement, remediation, and counseling. Who will pay for these programs? Do they effectively bring underprepared students up to a level with their peers?

Palm Beach Community College (PBCC) reports that from 47 to 51 percent of its students are admitted classified as underprepared by virtue of state test scores (PBCC Office of Institutional Research, 1991). This percentage is roughly equivalent with other community colleges nationally, a fact which diminishes causality from community' sampling effect.

Community colleges certainly attract many students who could not gain admission to a university based on test scores or high school GPA; but equally, community colleges attract academically qualified students simply seeking a break in tuition for the first two years of college. This enrollment places a significant burden on community college faculty who must deal with a greater diversity in the mix of students than do their counterparts in the highly selective university.

However, many faculty believe the percentage of underprepared students are misleading since some students manage to pass above the floor level of state tests; yet, they perform submarginally in the classroom. This information is further validation that the exclusive use of test scores to classify students may be flawed. Also, potentially good students may be misclassified as underprepared since they simply may not be "good test takers"; and other students, who may need remediation to succeed, may marginally pass the state test and move prematurely into the mainstream at increased risk.

A more distressing statistic emerges the from the examination of the profiles of graduates to determine how many in that group needed remediation at some time in their academic experience. According to Palm Beach Community College's Office of Institutional Research, only about 10 to 12 percent of PBCC graduates took any remediation courses.

It would be inappropriate to conclude statistical significance directly from a simple comparison between the entry and exit statistics offered above. There are too many intervening variables between entry and exit to conclude or predict a relationship.

Eileen Holden, PBCC's CPI Program Manager, cited a number of students, particularly ESOL learners, who enter college for a specific purpose other than to obtain a degree. Although her evidence does not account for the skewed difference between entry level underpreparedness percentages and the significantly lower percentages of graduates who needed remediation at some point in college, the percentages strongly suggest further research is needed to develop an enhanced student tracking system to establish a valid database for a more extensive multivariate analysis. Only then would a possible, and, I might add, a probable empirical link be discovered.

Cost of Preparing the Underprepared Student

Generally, many colleges and universities report in the literature that the cost of offering remediation programs are high. This fact is true of the most aggressive programs since they are typically better staffed with well trained faculty, counselors, and tutors. Programs experiencing marginal success rates may be less costly in direct budget dollars, but also are often less effective in terms of the numbers of students who actually persist to graduation, the perceived goal of any developmental program.

Again, with improved student tracking systems, assessing programs using cost-benefit analysis improves both the budgeting process and the effectiveness of the program. It is important to know when a program could be enhanced by a moderate infusion of budget dollars resulting in a significant incremental increase in results. Also, it is

important to know when throwing more money at a problem is not the solution given; given the law of diminishing returns, program changes may need to be identified first.

Regardless, if more than half of all entering freshman arrive at college largely unprepared to enter the mainstream of academic work, remediation in some form is a necessary and expensive conclusion. But, some faculty have expressed resentment since these programs can be narrowly viewed as siphoning available funds from other, legitimate educational programs. Program salesmanship often must begin with the faculty.

The reality is that student enrollment is vital to the continued growth of any college, and the reality is, also, that half of them will not be prepared. Essentially, like them or not, developmental education programs are here to stay. However, the most important focus of institutional resources should be on the students and their persistence to graduation.

The impact on the community college goes beyond budget considerations. The problem demands an integrated team approach which includes faculty (not just developmental program faculty), counselors, CPI staff, and others, including peer counselors and peer tutors, to work with underprepared students.

One responsibility of the community college is to prepare students for either a terminal degree or certificate enabling them to enter the work force directly or for an Associate in Arts degree enabling them to transfer to a four year institution. It is not the role of the community college to be viewed as a way station for the non-college bound student, nor as a contributor to the "Dumbing-down" of America, nor, as I have heard said many times, to be viewed as a grade 13.

III. FACTORS BEARING ON THE UNDERPREPARED STUDENT

Given previous studies (Tinto, 1975; Nora, Attinasi,& Matonak, 1990; Rose & Hull, 1989) citing the wide range of disparities among underprepared students leads conceptually to a student-centered focus. The most critical factors should be examined so that planned interventions into individual student underpreparedness problems can be implemented by an integrated program involving faculty, staff, and the student.

If a purely program focus is maintained, as determined by faculty or CPI staff, then only those individual student problems that can be helped by that particular program will be adequately addressed, while much of the rest falls through the cracks. This situation may lead to at least one explanation as to why so few remedial students make it to graduation. The program was a success, but the student failed.

Faculty Involvement

> "The role of the faculty member must change from gatekeeper to guardian. Their job must not be to weed out students, but to help them succeed" (Banach, 1991). Research repeatedly bears out that there is no stronger link between student success and failure than a dedicated, involved faculty. Indeed, the closer the link between individual faculty and individual students--a mentoring relationship--the more likely the student is to succeed, not only in that faculty member's course, but in other courses as well.

There is no substitute for the bond between teacher and student. Many students have been found to overcome seemingly insurmountable academic and social handicaps to persist in their education at the encouragement of a single faculty member who became a role model or significant other in the life of the student.

In order to assist faculty in maximizing their effectiveness in these teacher-student mentor relationships, it is necessary to promote development programs for teachers. These programs should address the role of teachers in supporting and encouraging the underprepared student. Further, these programs should increase the sensitivity of teachers toward the variety of problems of students, the sources of specialized assistance, and the major importance of faculty-staff-counselor cooperation and close followup.

This charge sounds relatively simple until other considerations intervene such as larger classes with high student-teacher ratios, the increasing use of adjunct faculty who do not have campus office hours, and the increasingly large

numbers of underprepared students. Then supportive one-on-one mentor relationships collapse under the sheer weight of time constraints.

Obviously, in the face of these limitations, there are no easily implementable solutions. However, it is nonetheless important to remember that often it is the one individual faculty member making the difference in the one individual student's life that makes all the difference in the world for that student.

Further, due to time constraints, that individual faculty member must work in closer coordination with the other players such as the CPI staff, tutors, and counselors. Again, this approach supports the conceptual model of a Student-Centered Process Coordination Model which involves a number of closely interested parties. The focus of attention falls on the student without the burden falling on any single player.

The Student's Family and Family History

Of possible lesser importance than faculty involvement, but still significant, is the role that a student's family plays in the persistence of that student to overcome academic deficiencies and graduate from college. Family factors contribute in part to the wide diversity of students entering college and the differing reasons for their academic underpreparedness.

Closely related are issues such as the student's socioeconomic condition, education attained by one or both parents, the level of warmth and support shown the student by family, and for adult students, whether or not they are married and whether or not the spouse and children are supportive.

A common example can be made by examining the single parent who could be a good student but who gets poor grades due to pressures experienced at home and at work (Rose, 1989). This student may be academically underprepared or just overpressured by life choices. In either event, planned intervention is appropriate to diagnose the problem and to work with the student toward solutions.

Again, support exists for the adoption of a concept of closer cooperation and coordination between faculty, CPI staff, counselors, and, of course, the student. A teacher may identify a problem student, establish through interaction with the student that a life choice problem exists, and refer that student to trained counselors who can then make recommendations.

On the other hand, the student may exhibit academic weaknesses that can be treated through a remediation program offered by the CPI staff or just additional tutoring to further emphasize class work. The faculty member can then follow up with the student, the counselor, tutor, or other staff, and make accommodations as appropriate to the circumstances.

Research has demonstrated that students from broken homes, from parents who did not attend college, from lower socioeconomic neighborhoods, from secondary schools that do not normally prepare many students for college, students that are adults but single, and students that are minorities are more often at risk on entering college (Rose, 1989). These external factors are not controllable by either the student or the college.

However, they are surmountable. Case history research (Rose, 1989) demonstrated that students can overcome these obstacles and persist to graduation, but often not without significant assistance from faculty, staff, and no less than the tenacious commitment of the student.

The Student: Self-concept, Expectations, Commitment

The student is the center of the process. The motivated or motivatable student is the one most likely to succeed, given a supportive family and a supportive institution providing positive educational experiences. There can be severe limitations in the other factors mentioned; and yet, the motivated, committed student expecting to graduate is most likely to graduate.

It can be speculated that one reason the faculty-student mentor relationship is so important is the fact that the bond serves to stimulate the internal motivation to succeed. If no one else believes in the student, the student must

believe in him or herself, and sometimes that belief system grows from the belief and encouragement of that one significant teacher--a guardian.

In the literature and in interviews with CPI managers and academic counselors, lack of motivation seems to be the most significant factor in ending many student's academic efforts. The frustration is keen. The student may not be in any way academically handicapped yet fails anyway to make satisfactory progress. Again, students must be evaluated as individuals rather than as a set of test scores. That is the only way to explain why a student who could be successful fails.

Jeanne L. Higbee (1989) identified three subgroups of students entering orientation programs and described ways to meet the diverse needs of the three subgroups as follows:

1. The underprepared student who is motivated but needs skill development:
    a. setting goals and objectives
    b. time management
    c. note taking
    d. reading comprehension
    e. memory skills
    f. taking exams
    g. decision making
    h. reducing stress
    i. math anxiety

2. Underachievers lacking motivation:
    a. values clarification
    b. career exploration
    c. time management
    d. health and wellness
    e. reducing stress
    f. creativity
    g. taking control of life

3. Students not at risk academically but needing orientation to college life
    a. adjusting to college life
    b. developmental tasks of late adolescence/early adulthood
    c. health and wellness
    d. race and gender issues

The point Higbee makes is that students in any of the three subgroups could enter college at varying levels of risk and fail to make adequate progress since their individual problems were not addressed by the institutional system.

College and Campus Atmosphere

Another important factor in a student's success, any student, is the atmosphere of the academic environment. Is it warm and supportive to the student, regardless of risk level, or is it a "sink or swim" survival experience--cold and imposing? Many students enter college for the first time with a sense of anxiety as they face a strange new environment where they don't not know the ropes, don't know their way around, and don't have any friends or family near the campus. These problems further exacerbate any preexisting academic underpreparedness. Indeed, many good students suffer "grade slump" during the first one or two semesters in college. The underprepared student starts out below the margin and may never progress without significant assistance from a college that seeks out the student and offers a helping hand toward adjustment.

Campus collegiality is listed among the top ten challenges for the nineties as indicated by The Institute for Future Studies in its 1991 report. Literature is largely silent as to how this collegiality is to be made a reality. This process remains a challenge to all faculty and staff, making the campus a "kinder, gentler place."

Availability of Remediation Services

Obviously, the utilization of remediation services by students self-selecting to seek those services depend largely on two issues: availability of programs and stigma attached to participation in those programs. Availability is probably the most significant, since the more prominent the program, the more likely students will seek assistance on their own.

Also, the program must be closely aligned with the mainstream of academia, not a sideshow. This coordination lends legitimacy to developmental departments sought by students who need the services, by the students who do not need special help (at least not now), and the staff who serve in the program.

The more successful programs discussed in the literature are all specifically included in the mainstream of campus academic activities. The tutorial staff are predominately full time, well trained professionals, not just good students earning some work-study money. The developmental staff must have true faculty status with all the rights and privileges of the regular faculty including tenure or continuing contracts. The program must have departmental status equal to that of any other academic department including a permanent program budget. The developmental staff should be represented on all academic committees as full members.

Other College Staff (Counselors and Tutors)

Peer tutors have been shown to be the most effective with most students particularly as long as the tutors have had an intensive training program in handling underprepared student problems. It is important to note that untrained peer tutors fare least well; while professional, full time teacher-tutors do better, but not as well as the trained peer tutors (Rose, 1989).

The results of several studies demonstrate that peer tutors, who are well trained and supervised, provide the best chance of assisting the underprepared student and are more likely to be favorably accepted by the student being tutored. The only exception in the research cited were black male students who didn't seem to like anyone (Glazer, 1989).

Counselors were examined and evaluated in several studies as to the nature and scope of their work in the college environment. They ranged from offering minimal assistance to the student--for example, merely giving a shopping list of courses from the school catalog that would be needed to graduate with a specific degree--to the fullest range of individualized counseling services working closely with other players in the college environment.

Judith Glazer (1989) reports on five critical areas of counseling required to comprehensively assess and intervene into student underpreparedness: academic, financial, personal, vocational or career, and psychological. This level of counseling, however, requires increasing the intensity of the counselor-student relationship while improving the counselor-student ratio.

Since the highest attrition rates occur during the freshman and sophomore years where 46.8 percent of the students leave school, Glazer recommends that counseling intensity is most critical for students during these first two years.

IV. FACULTY BEARING ON THE UNDERPREPARED STUDENT

This paper was originally presented at the first conference organized by the Faculty Development Center at Palm Beach Community College's South Campus in Boca Raton, Florida. The conference consisted of several paper readings on related issues of student underpreparedness, a panel discussion, and break-out groups to work through the Student-Centered Process Coordination Model.

The faculty and academic support staff (n=47) randomly sorted into interdisciplinary groups to discuss methods and procedural changes related to the theme of the conference. The charge to the groups was to brainstorm an

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

organizational reorientation within the theoretical framework of the model (see attachment for a diagram of the model). The focus of discussion was to be toward changes that could be made by: 1. the college as a whole (four campuses); 2. the South Campus as a unit; and 3. the faculty on the South Campus.

The results of the break-out groups were initially encouraging, but the long-term commitment to change was a disappointment. Of greater importance, the impact of the entire effort was futile since two years later the initial percentages of student retention remains constant at a lower level than any institution would like to experience.

An attachment titled: "Faculty Development Center: The Underprepared Student Faculty Recommendations" lists the specific recommendations resulting from the break-out groups. Each issue was discussed with all the groups at the end of the conference to share their ideas. Each idea or recommendation was placed on a large poster-sized representation of the model approximately where it fit on the transactional arrows between the four primary actors in the process. This representation illustrated how the model worked and how each idea or recommendation from the different break-out groups fit within the model.

Many of the recommendations made by the participants fit well with the literature recommendations reported in the original paper. This correlation was particularly true with emphasis placed on increased faculty-student interaction, increased emphasis on pre-college advisement, increased counseling staff, increased facilities for adjunct professors to meet with students outside of class, increased cooperation between faculty and CPI staff, and increased formal referrals to the CPI staff from the faculty. A survey of students to gather information on course loads, time constraints, and their work schedule as well as family issues was recommended to get to know students for better advisement. Each suggestion for change would serve to individualize the program for the benefit of those students entering college at-risk.

Two months after the conference, the original paper and the recommendations from the break-out groups were reviewed by a small committee represented by two discipline department chairs, the Director of the South Campus Center for Personalized Instruction (CPI), the South Campus Continuing Studies Coordinator, and one faculty member. A memo was prepared for the Provost, the Dean of Academic Affairs, and the Dean of Student Affairs outlining the committee's views on the feasibility of the recommendations. Of the 39 original recommendations, 16 were rejected as unrealistic, 19 were recommended for further study, and 4 were passed over as too vague to effectively consider. Further, of the 19 that were recommended for further study, none were studied, followed-up or ever implemented.

Essentially, in academic year 1993, the statistics for underprepared student performance remained much the same as it was in 1991. Failing to change the way an institution works with its underprepared students translates into no improvement in retention or persistence to graduation. The conclusions offered in the paper seem validated by the results experienced here by one institution by its failure to act on an obvious problem.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

NOTE: This bibliography contains some material not cited in the body of the paper. It is offered to the readers as a reference list.

1. Ackerman, Susan P. and Byrock, Gayle J. (1989). Freshman Summer Program and Transfer Summer Program. Phase I. UCLA, Office of the Provost. 247 pages.

This extensive review of UCLA's summer program for underprepared freshmen demonstrates the commitment of a campus to assisting students in their transition into college. The authors review many aspects of the program from the training of peer tutors to departmental organization and departmental placement within the academic community of UCLA. The review can form a template for the development of similar programs nationally.

2. Bray, D. (1987). Assessment and Placement of Developmental Highrisk Students. In K.M. Arendt's (Ed.), Teaching the Developmental Education Student. New Directions for Community Colleges, (pp.33-47). (Report #ISBN 1-5542-958-0) Office of Educational Research and Improvement. San Francisco: Josey-Bass (ERIC ED280519).

Bray's model focuses on the linkages between assessment and instruction producing a broader definition. He indicates four major trends: a majority of college students have deficiencies in one or more of the basic skills; colleges and industry are raising their expectations in terms of competency; remediation is fast-growing within the curriculum; and most colleges identify students needing developmental courses through assessment as entering students.

4. Carbone, G.J. (1987). Academic Support Services for Developmental and High-risk Students in Community Colleges. In K.M. Arendt's (Ed.), Teaching the Developmental Education Student. New Directions for Community Colleges, (pp.23-31). (Report # ISBN 155543-958-0) Office of Educational Research and Improvement. San Francisco: Josey-Bass. (ERIC ED280519)

Carbone believes that success of a student depends on factors beyond the remediation of basic skills. A holistic approach is essential. Keys to effective programs include: strong administrative support, mandatory assessment and placement, structured courses and followup, award of credit for developmental courses, flexible completion features, multiple learning systems, extensive use of peer tutors, frequent monitoring of student behavior, interfacing with subsequent courses, and program evaluation based on adequate data collection. Carbone further emphasizes student motivation and faculty assistance.

5. Cohen, A.M. (1985). Helping Ensure the Right to Succeed: An ERIC review. Community College Review, 12(3), pp.4-9.

Cohen reports that since the "right to fail" has gone the way of other unfounded experiments in education, many community colleges have gone back to previous patterns of mandatory testing and placement of students in classes according to their probable chances of success. Lack of new students has shifted emphasis to retention to graduation. He believes that the success of remediation programs begins with a buy-in attitude of "we care".

6. Cohen, A.R. (1987). Responding to Criticism of Developmental Education. In K.M. Arendt's (Ed.), Teaching the Developmental Education Student. New Directions for Community Colleges(pp. 3-10). (Report #ISBN 1-55542-958-0) Office of Educational Research and Improvement. San Francisco: Josey-Bass. (ERIC ED280519).

Cohen believes that since a large portion of students who enter community colleges with inadequate basic skills dictates that developmental studies be at the heart of the curriculum and involve all college personnel. He addresses six key complaints about community college involvement in developmental education including the one about remediation programs should be separate from mainstream academic programs. He also points out that articulation between community colleges and secondary schools should be enhanced.

7. Glazer, Judith S. (1985). Education for the Disadvantaged: The Higher Education Opportunity Program in New York State. (ERIC ED323833). 19 pages.

Glazer recommends mandatory summer transition programs for underprepared students which would include tutoring, counseling, developmental and remedial courses for credit and noncredit, and pre and post program testing for placement and evaluation. She also proposes comprehensive counseling in five areas: academic, personal, financial, vocational/career, and psychological. She uses two major models to explain educational progress: entering student characteristics and college environmental factors.

8. Goslin, Joseph C. (1989). Underachievers: A Curriculum Design. Preventing School Failure. (pp.22-28).

Goslin is another holistic approach to the underachiever. He believes the failure of the system begins as early as junior high school and continues until the system no longer lets the student slide through. Some important student characteristics include: student does not commit himself to concrete goals, does not keep a record of progress, does not feel he belongs to a successful group. Goslin also offers a litany of statistics on the dismal performance of high school students. Radical reform is the only remedy.

9. Higbee, Jeanne L. (1989). Orientation Courses: Meeting the Needs of Different Student Populations. 21 pages. (ERIC ED311801)

Higbee recommends that orientation not be major programmatic but be adjusted to differing student populations from the underprepared but motivated to the unmotivated student. She offers some specific guidance, but it is not a template for establishing such an orientation-remediation program.

10. Hull, Glynda and Rose, Mike, (1989). Rethinking Remediation: Toward a Social-Cognitive Understanding of Problematic Reading and Writing. (Technical Report #19), Center for the Study of Writing, Berkeley, CA., Center for the Study of Writing, Pittsburgh, PA. 19 pages.

Both authors attempt a new interpretation of what is acceptable writing styles and demonstrate that at face value, writing that appears substandard is a student's attempt to document reality as that individual student sees it.

11. J. Daniel House and Victoria Wohit (1990). The Effect of Tutoring Program Participation on the Performance of Academically Underprepared College Freshmen. Journal of College Student Development, Vol 31. (pp.365-370).

A comprehensive overview of successful tutoring program strategies and demographics of students who seem to find tutoring most successful given the characteristics of the tutor. Trained peer tutors seem to fare the best.

12. Kelly, D.K. ~1988). Motivating the Underprepared Unmotivated Community College Student. (ERIC ED299009).

Kelly points out that all motivated students are welcomed in community colleges whether underprepared or not. The author believes that anyone who really wants to improve their skills can do it with motivation. Two kinds of unmotivated students are apparent; those who have the abilities and those who are deficient in basic skills. The author concludes with the fact that the underprepared are here to stay and the challenge is for the community college to develop coping strategies.

13. Nora, Amaury, L.C. Attinasi, and Andrew Matonak (1990).

Testing Qualitative Indicators of Precollege Factors in Tinto's Attrition Model: A Community College Student Population. Review of
Higher Education, Spring, Vol 13, No. 3. (pp.337-356).

This is an extensive report supporting Tinto's earlier (1975) research on qualitative factors bearing on student attrition. It forms part of the basis for my concept of a Student-Centered Process Coordination Model for Dealing

with the Underprepared Student. The work of Tinto and those replicating his research is more empirical based on statistical analysis of real populations. Some sophistication in multivariate analysis is required to fully understand this article.

14. Ochroch, S.K. & Dugan, M. (1986). Personality Factors for Successful High-risk Students. Community/Junior College Quarterly 10 (pp.95-100).

The authors' purpose of the study was to identify personal factors related to academic success of high-risk students. The highest-risk students (those least successful in terms of persistence and grade point averages) were young, black males who were single, unemployed and receiving financial aid. More successful of the group were female and married. The successful group scored significantly higher on self-esteem, assertiveness, and internal locus of control. The unsuccessful were controlled by chance and stress. The authors conclude that there is a need for equal attention to personality factors as well as basic skills development in dealing with high-risk students.

15. Piland, W.E. and Pierce, D. (1985). Remedial Education in the States. Community College Review, 12(3), pp.16-20.

Based on a three page survey to all 50 states directors of community colleges, of which 40 responded, most states did not have a working definition of remedial education and did not feel they needed one. Also, 62 percent of the respondents reported more emphasis on remedial education than five years ago.

16. Pobywajlo, Margaret (1989). The AFY Program at UNHM: Reaching Out to Underprepared Students. 8 pages. (ERIC ED324673).

A brief overview of a community college division of the University of New Hampshire. The underprepared students attend what is called an Alternate First Year which is developmental in nature specifically to prepare them for transition into UNH's regular academic schedule.

17. Robinson, Patricia W. (1990). Development of Study Skills Curriculum as a Component of the Act I Extended Freshman Orientation Experience at Brenau: Curriculum and Program Planning. 46 pages. (ERIC ED323864).

Robinson presents a detailed overview of basic skills development in a program designed to offer freshman a longer orientation period recognizing that all students do not necessarily pace at the same speed.

18. Rose, Mike (1989). Lives on the Boundary. New York: Penguin.

This book of case studies and antidotal on various issues such as the politics of remediation, and others, is must reading for anyone interested in developing a successful program or trying to determine why an existing program isn't living up to expectations. Rose points out emphatically that students are individuals coming to college labeled as underprepared, but each with different reasons for being behind his or her peers and programmatic solutions will not capture all the students, only the ones whose specific problem is treatable by the program's major emphasis. Rose recommends a more individualized approach and agrees with other authors that developmental programs require administrative support, recognition, job security and a role in the mainstream of academic activities on campus.

19. The Top Ten Issues Facing America's Community Colleges, 1991 Edition. Macomb Community College Institute of Future Studies. Warren, Michigan. 28 pages. ~ERIC ED327248).

At least two of the top ten issues cited in this work bear on the underdeveloped student: one, that there will be more of them and two, that collegiality on campus needs improvement.

20. Long Beach City College, Center for Faculty Development. Strategies from the Faculty: Working with Underprepared Students.

This is a handbook of ideas developed by the faculty at Long Beach City College using a similar forum to our own Center for Faculty Development at Palm Beach Community College South Campus.

Faculty Development Center
The Underprepared Student
Faculty Recommendations

The following recommendations were made at the program held October 18, 1991.

Recommendations To The College

1. Mandatory counselling for unresponsible academic behavior
2. Letter for notification of failing grades at midterm
3. Smaller class size in the skills building courses
4. Prerequisite testing for all students--enforced
5. Drop and Add period prior to start of semester
6. Required study skills course, i.e. College Survival Skills
7. Better system to enforce prerequisites
8. Emphasize more faculty and student advisement and involvement; deemphasize committees
9. Monies for adjuncts to tutor or counsel
10. Lobby legislature for proper funding for remedial program
11. Enforce sequencing of courses
12. Offer sections of existing course for underprepared students
13. Send literature to high school students informing them of minimal skills needed and study time required to succeed at PBCC

Recommendations To The South Campus

1. CPI staff can teach reading out of course text books
2. Offer a "Strategies for Succeeding at College" program during the mandatory orientation.
3. Liaison to high schools to teach study skills and develop rapport with high school teachers; improve articulation
4. Increase counselling staff
5. Focus student orientation on academic expectations and support systems; include time management segment
6. Continue faculty development interaction
7. Assignment of a counselor to each discipline
8. Facilities for adjuncts to meet with students
9. Reduce class size for effective interaction
10. More formal communication between CPI and faculty
11. Block remedial students from taking courses which require the skills being remediated
12. Follow up on the recommendations made

Recommendations To The Faculty On The South Campus:

1. Student and faculty mentoring
2. More involvement between faculty and CPI staff
3. Faculty tutors in CPI
4. Upgrade course standards
5. Suggest techniques to help students: computer programs, study groups, peer tutors, study skills
6. Provide diagnostic tests in the first week of class
7. Require students to view "Where There's A Will There's An A"
8. Formal referrals to the CPI with follow up
9. Survey students for information related to course load, time constraints, work schedule, family responsibilities in order to get to know them
10. Faculty in same discipline exchange class sections for a day or two
11. Faculty should meet to discuss interdisciplinary approaches to teaching all students

12. Reinforce basic skills in all classes; test or evaluate almost every class meeting; give assignments that can be checked in steps
13. Obtain a writing sample
14. Include information about student success in your course on the syllabus